



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
09/083, 150	05/22/98	BOUSSOUIRA	05/22/98

HM12/0119

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW
GARRETT & DUNNER
1300 I STREET N W
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

WEBMAN, E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1617

6

DATE MAILED: 01/19/00

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/21/98

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 1 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1 - 44 is/are pending in the application
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration
 Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 Claim(s) 1 - 44 are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
 The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
 The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
 The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
 All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
 received.
 received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
 received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____
 Interview Summary, PTO-413
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

-SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES-

Art Unit: 1615

In view of errors noted by applicants, the restriction of Paper # 4 is withdrawn and rewritten as follows:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-28, 33-35, 37, drawn to a composition, classified in class 424, subclass 78.17+.
- II. Claims 29-32, 36, 38-44, drawn to a method of use, classified in class 514, subclass 844.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and process of using the product. The use as claimed cannot be practiced with a materially different product. Since the product is not allowable, restriction is proper between said method of making and method of using. The product claim will be examined along with the elected invention (MPEP § 806.05(I)).

The process as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product such as with an nonpolymeric antioxidant such as aminobenzoic acid.

Should applicants elect Group I, the following elections of species are required:

Polymer Unit
Claims 1, 6, 7 are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising polymers. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Art Unit: 1615

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claim 27 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising forms. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- a.) a cosmetic composition with neither a metal-complexing agent nor a protein specified (claims 1-20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 33-35, 37).
- b.) a cosmetic composition ~~with a metal composition~~ with a metal-complexing agent specified (claims 24-26),
- c.) a cosmetic composition with a protein specified (claim 21).

Art Unit: 1615

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, cosmetic compositions are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

→ *81100* *Claim 38 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising polymers. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.* *Group II the following elections of species are required:*

Art Unit: 1615

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Claim 38 is generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species comprising objects of treatment (substrate or composition). Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone restriction was not attempted due to the complexity of the requirement.

Art Unit: 1615

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Edward Webman at telephone number (703) 308-4432.

E. Webman:jmr

Jan. 12, 2000



EDWARD J. WEBMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500